UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,821	06/18/2001	Kenneth P. Mallon	017887-009000US	3509

7590   12/18/2007

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
NBC TOWER, SUITE 3600
455 N. CITYFRONT PLAZA DRIVE
CHICAGO, IL 60611-5599

EXAMINER
VAN DOREN, BETH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 October 2007</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.** 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-7, 11-13 and 16-43* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-7, 11-13 and 16-43* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The following is a Final office action in response to communications received 10/9/07.

Claims 1-7, 11-13, and 16-43 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with regards to Tamayo et al. (U.S. 2002/0083067) in view of

Heching et al. (U.S. 7,054,828) have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. In the

remarks, Applicant argues that (1) neither Tamayo et al. nor Heching et al. teach or suggest a

system that predicts aggregate behavior or economic activity of a population based on behavior

or economic activity different than that to be modeled; examiner acknowledges that Tayamo et

al. does not teach predicting aggregate behavior (1 and 11) or economic activity (16 or 38), (2)

Heching et al. does not teach or suggest predicting aggregate behavior based on behavior or

economic activity that is related to, but different than, the behavior or economic activity to be

modeled of the population.

In response to arguments (1) and (2), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Tamayo et al.

discloses a modeling system that gathers aggregate on-line interest data, the on-line interest data

based on passive observation of on-line behavior of a subpopulation, wherein the on-line

behavior is related to, but different than, the behavior to be modeled, and wherein the

subpopulation comprises a subset of the population. The system of Tamayo et al. collects

implicit data from a subpopulation of users who visit the website. This information includes

click stream data, time spent on aspects of sites, purchase patterns, etc. See 0034, 0039, 0058-9,

0065, 0112, 0229-30, 0234-5, 0239. The system is then able to build models and make

predictions for these and future users (i.e. the population) based on the data held in the system.

The system makes predictions such as products to recommend and cross-sell based on collected implicit data – the implicit data is related to but different than the modeled likelihood of the user to purchase a certain item. However, while the system predicts behavior related to a subject for many users, Tamayo et al. does not expressly disclose predicting aggregate behavior of the population related to the subject. This is because the system of Tamayo et al. is making predictions for future users of the site and is developing a technique by modeling future users who will be the population (but are not the current population). This is why, with regards to claims 1 and 11 examiner states that Tayamo et al. does not teach predicting aggregate behavior *of a population* and with regards to claims 16 and 38 Tayamo et al. does not teach predicting aggregate economic activity *by the population* economic activity.

Heching et al. discloses predicting aggregate behavior and population estimates for a population based on data obtained from a subset of the population and predicting aggregate behavior of the population related to the subject. Therefore, Heching et al., in an analogous teaching, was relied upon to teach an environment where the population is specifically known to the party making the predictions. See figure 1, column 1, lines 60-67, column 4, lines 10-20 and 40-45, column 6, lines 55-65, column 7, lines 20-30 and 51-53, which discloses predicting aggregate behavior and population estimates for a population based on data obtained from a subset of the populations related to the subject. See also column 12, lines 10-15. It is important to note that Heching et al. was not relied upon to teach predicting based on data that is related to, but different than, the activity to be modeled.

Therefore, examiner maintains that the combination does teach and suggest the limitations as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-7, 11-13, 16-24, and 26-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Tamayo et al. (U.S. 2002/0083067) in view of Heching et al. (U.S. 7,054,828).

As per claim 1, Tamayo et al. teaches a method of predicting behavior of a population,

the method comprising:

providing a modeling system configured to model aggregate behavior of a population

as a function of aggregate on-line interest data, the on-line interest data based on passive

observation of on-line behavior of a subpopulation, wherein the on-line behavior is related to, but

different than, the behavior to be modeled, and wherein the subpopulation comprises a subset of

the population (See figure 15, paragraphs 0034, 0036, 0039, 0058-9, 0065, 0086, 0112, 0136,

0157, 0229-30, 0234-5, 0239, wherein a modeling system is presented. The system is built to be

able to collect data concerning the online behavior of a set of users of a website, and then the

system is able to build models and make predictions for these and future users (i.e. the

population) based on the data held in the system);

inputting to the modeling system on-line interest data related to a subject (See paragraphs

0037-9, 0056-8, 0068, 0071-2, 0080-1, 0084, 0112-5, wherein the users behavior is monitored

and data concerning this behavior is input into the model to make predictions. The data is related

to a subject (i.e. product that the user is likely to purchase). See also paragraphs 0136, 0138, 0151, 0157, and 0175);

generating, with the modeling system, a prediction of behavior related to the subject (See paragraphs 0070-3, 0084, 0097, 0114, 0136, 0138-9, 0151, 0157-8, 0225, wherein predictions are made concerning future behavior, specifically with regards to purchasing a product).

However, while the system predicts behavior related to a subject for many users, Tamayo et al. does not expressly disclose predicting aggregate behavior of the population related to the subject.

Heching et al. discloses predicting aggregate behavior and population estimates for a population based on data obtained from a subset of the population and predicting aggregate behavior of the population related to the subject (See figure 1, column 1, lines 60-67, column 4, lines 10-20 and 40-45, column 6, lines 55-65, column 7, lines 20-30 and 51-53, which discloses predicting aggregate behavior and population estimates for a population based on data obtained from a subset of the populations related to the subject. See also column 12, lines 10-15).

Both Heching et al. and Tamayo et al. disclose using past data concerning a customer to forecast behavior of customers at websites. Tamayo et al. specifically builds models that are applicable to aggregate customers. Heching et al. teaches predicting aggregate behavior and population estimates for a population based on data obtained from a subset of the population. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to predicting aggregate behavior related to the subject (i.e product) in order to increase the improve the understanding of past or current population beliefs and behaviors and to forecast these values. See column 1, lines 54-60, of Heching et al.

As per claim 2, Tamayo et al. teaches wherein the modeling system is further configured

to model aggregate behavior of as a function of characteristics of the subject to which the

behavior is related, the method further comprising inputting to the modeling system data related

to characteristics of the subject (See paragraphs 0058, 0080-1, 0104, 0114, 0127-8, 0136, 0140,

0151, 0177-81, 0201-2, which discloses characteristics (attributes, keywords, etc.) of the subject

which are used in the model).

As per claim 3, Tamayo et al. teaches training the modeling system with a learning data

set, the learning data set including: on-line interest data related to another subject, the another

subject related to the subject; and actual aggregate behavior data relating to the another subject

(See figures 15 and 16, paragraphs 0034, 0059, 0094-5, 0115-6, 0138-9, 0175, 0185, which

discloses training the models of the system using transactional and activity data of the users of

the system, the system storing such data for a plurality of users).

As per claim 4, Tamayo et al. teaches wherein the on-line interest data includes on-line

usage data (See paragraphs 0034, 0039-40, 0043, 0056, 0068, 0076-81, which discloses

collecting data such as click stream data, navigation data, etc.).

As per claims 5-6, Tamayo et al. teaches wherein the aggregate behavior to be modeled is

aggregate economic activity and wherein the aggregate economic activity to be modeled is

related to a product (See paragraphs 0070, 0075-81, 0086, 0138, 0175, which discloses that

purchase behavior is collected and stored and used to drive a recommendation process

recommending products to the user. See also paragraphs 0037, 0068, 0070-3, 0082).

As per claim 7, Tamayo et al. teaches wherein the product is selected from the group

consisting of a movie, a video tape, a CD, a DVD, a model of automobile, a book, a toy, an

appliance, an electronic device, a pharmaceutical product, and a software product (See

paragraphs 0040, 0068, 0070-3, 0084, wherein books and videos are at least discussed).

Claims 11-13 recite equivalent limitations to claims 1-3, respectively, and are therefore

rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

As per claim 16, Tamayo et al. teaches a method of predicting a measure of aggregate

economic activity related to a product, the method comprising:

providing a modeling system configured to model aggregate economic activity of a type

of product as a function of aggregate on-line interest data related to products comprising the

type, wherein the on-line interest data is based on passive observation of on-line behavior of a

subpopulation, wherein the on-line behavior is related to, but different than, the economic

activity to be modeled, and wherein the subpopulation comprises a subset of a population that

engages in the economic activity to be modeled (See figure 15, paragraphs 0034, 0036, 0039,

0058-9, 0065, 0086, 0112, 0136, 0157, 0229-30, 0234-5, 0239, wherein a modeling system is

presented. The system is built to be able to collect data concerning the online behavior of a set

of users of a website, and then the system is able to build models and make predictions for these

and future users (i.e. the population) based on the data held in the system);

inputting to the modeling system on-line interest data related to a first product

comprising the type (See paragraphs 0037-9, 0056-8, 0068, 0071-2, 0080-1, 0084, 0112-5,

wherein the users behavior is monitored and data concerning this behavior is input into the

model to make predictions. The data is related to a subject (i.e. product that the user is likely to

purchase). See also paragraphs 0136, 0138, 0151, 0157, and 0175); and

generating a prediction of the behavior/activity related to the first product with the

modeling system (See paragraphs 0070-3, 0084, 0097, 0114, 0136, 0138-9, 0151, 0157-8, 0225,

wherein predictions are made concerning future behavior, specifically with regards to purchasing

a product).

However, while the system predicts activity related to a product for many users, Tamayo

et al. does not expressly disclose predicting aggregate economic activity by the population

related to the product.

Heching et al. discloses predicting aggregate behavior and population estimates for a

population based on data obtained from a subset of the population and predicting aggregate

behavior of the population related to the subject (See figure 1, column 1, lines 60-67, column 4,

lines 10-20 and 40-45, column 6, lines 55-65, column 7, lines 20-30 and 51-53, which discloses

predicting aggregate behavior and population estimates for a population based on data obtained

from a subset of the populations related to the subject. See also column 12, lines 10-15).

Both Heching et al. and Tamayo et al. disclose using past data concerning a customer to forecast

behavior of customers at websites. Tamayo et al. specifically builds models that are applicable

to aggregate customers. Heching et al. teaches predicting aggregate behavior and population

estimates for a population based on data obtained from a subset of the population. It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to predicting

aggregate behavior related to the subject (i.e product) in order to increase the improve the

understanding of past or current population beliefs and behaviors and to forecast these values.

See column 1, lines 54-60, of Heching et al.

As per claim 17, Tamayo et al. discloses wherein the modeling system is further

configured to model aggregate economic activity of a type of product as a function of

characteristics of products comprising the type and inputting to the modeling system data related

to characteristics of the first product (See paragraphs 0058, 0080-1, 0104, 0114, 0127-8, 0136,

0140, 0151, 0177-81, 0201-2, which discloses characteristics (attributes, keywords, etc.) of the

subject which are used in the model. See also paragraph 0235).

As per claim 18, Tamayo et al. discloses training the modeling system with a learning

data set, the learning data set including: on-line interest data related to a second product

comprising the type; data related to characteristics of the second product; and aggregate

economic activity data relating to the second product (See figures 15 and 16, paragraphs 0034,

0059, 0094-5, 0115-6, 0138-9, 0175, 0185, which discloses training the models of the system

using transactional and activity data of the users of the system, the system storing such data for a

plurality of users. See also paragraphs 0037, 0068, 0070-3, 0075-82, 0086, which discloses that

purchase behavior is collected and stored and used to drive a recommendation process

recommending products to the user).

As per claim 19, Tamayo et al. teaches wherein training the model includes: adding to the

learning data set additional data related to characteristics of the second product; and retraining

the modeling system with the learning data set (See paragraphs 0072, 0110, 0149, which

discloses updating the model for accuracy).

Claims 20-21 recite equivalent limitations to claims 18-19 and are therefore rejected

using the same art and rationale set forth above.

As per claim 22, Tamayo et al. teaches wherein the on-line interest data related to the first product includes counts of page hits of a web page related to the first product (See paragraphs 0058, 0068, 0080, 0136-8, 0171, 0175, 0211, 0229-32, 0235, wherein webpage hits related to a product are counted).

As per claim 23, Tamayo et al. teaches wherein the on-line interest data related to the first product includes counts of search queries at a web site that include a phrase related to the first product (See paragraphs 0058, 0175, 0208, 0211, 0225, wherein searches related to a product are monitored).

As per claim 24, Tamayo et al. teaches wherein the on-line interest data related to the first product includes an on-line interest measurement provided by a web site (See paragraphs 0110, 0114, 0152, 0160, and 0183, which discusses interest).

As per claim 26, Tamayo et al. wherein the on-line interest measurement provided by a web site is a percentage of users of the web site initiating searches related to the first product (See paragraphs 0110, 0114, 0152, 0160, and 0183, which discusses interest. See also paragraphs 0132, 0157-8, 0161-2, which discusses percentages of users).

As per claim 27, Tamayo et al. teaches wherein the on-line interest data related to the first product includes aggregate Internet usage data related to the first product (See paragraphs 0058, 0080, 0114, 0136, 0175, 0208, 0211, 0225, wherein internet activity related to the product is recorded).

As per claim 28, Tamayo et al. teaches wherein the aggregate Internet usage data related to the first product includes statistics based on analyses of online events related to the first

product (See paragraphs 0059, 0068, 0090, 0094, 0097, 0104, 0128, 0140, 0213, which discusses

some statistical techniques used to analyze the behavior).

As per claim 29, Tamayo et al. teaches wherein online events include a result of a client

making a request of a server and the server providing a response to the client (See paragraphs

0058, 0175, 0208, 0211, 0225, wherein searches related to a product are monitored).

As per claims 30-31, Tamayo et al. teaches wherein the analyses of online events

includes:

automatically associating each online event with one or more subjects (See figure 15,

paragraphs 0034, 0036, 0039, 0058-9, 0065, 0086, 0112, 0136, 0157, 0229-30, 0234-5, 0239,

wherein a modeling system is presented. The system is built to be able to collect data concerning

the online behavior of a set of users of a website related to one or more subjects);

accumulating counts for events by subject (See Table A, paragraphs 0114-5, wherein

number of items are stored); and

identifying one or more categories relevant to each subject (See paragraphs 0059, 0112,

0152, which discloses grouping data);

accumulating counts for events by category (See figure 15, paragraphs 0034, 0036, 0039,

0058-9, 0065, 0086, 0112, 0136, 0157, 0229-30, 0234-5, 0239, wherein data is accumulated for

events that occur online); and

However, Tamayo et al. does not expressly disclose outputting the accumulated counts

for each subject or for each category.

Tamayo et al. discloses a system that tracks and stores online event data and has the

capability to output data. Examiner takes official notice that outputting stored data from a

system is old and well known in the art as a way to allow a user to understand the data contained

therein. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to include outputting the data collected by Tamayo et al. in order to allow a user to see and

understand the data collected by the system.

As per claim 32, Tamayo et al. teaches wherein the analyses of online events further

includes determining if a subject for an event is a canonical equivalent of another subject; and

wherein counts for canonical equivalents are accumulated together (See figure 15, paragraphs

0068, 0088, 0112, 0175, 0208, 0210-1, 0225, which discloses keywords and conceptual classes).

As per claim 33, Tamayo et al. wherein the analyses of online events further includes

normalizing counts for events over a field of events (See paragraphs 0013, 0031, 0095-6, 0170,

0235, which discloses bringing together the events in a formatted and standardized manner).

However, Tamayo et al. does not expressly disclose outputting the accumulated counts.

Tamayo et al. discloses a system that tracks and stores online event data and has the

capability to output data. Examiner takes official notice that outputting stored data from a

system is old and well known in the art as a way to allow a user to understand the data contained

therein. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to include outputting the data collected by Tamayo et al. in order to allow a user to see and

understand the data collected by the system.

As per claim 34, Tamayo et al. teaches wherein the analyses of online events further

includes: determining a set of one or more demographic parameters relating to users that prompt

the events (See paragraphs 0058, 0064, 0070-1, 0084, 0086, 0112, 0235, wherein demographic

data is integrated with the other data stored in the system); and

using the set of one or more demographic parameters to partition the counts by

demographic divisions (See paragraphs 0058, 0064, 0070-1, 0084, 0086, 0112, 0235, wherein

the demographic data is linked to online activity to classify such data)

Claim 35 recites equivalent limitations to claim 7 and is therefore rejected using the same

art and rationale set forth above.

As per claim 36, Tamayo et al. does not expressly disclose that the predicted measure of

economic activity is a predicted number of sales during a period of time. Heching et al. discloses

predicting aggregate behavior and population estimates for a population based on data obtained

from a subset of the population and predicting aggregate behavior of the population related to

sales, such as purchasing and purchase intent (See figure 1, column 1, lines 60-67, column 4,

lines 10-20 and 40-45, column 6, lines 55-65, column 7, lines 20-30 and 51-53, which discloses

predicting aggregate behavior and population estimates for a population based on data obtained

from a subset of the populations related to the subject. See also column 12, lines 10-15).

Both Heching et al. and Tamayo et al. disclose using past data concerning a customer to

forecast behavior of customers at websites. Tamayo et al. specifically builds models that are

applicable to aggregate customers. Heching et al. teaches predicting aggregate behavior and

population estimates for a population based on data obtained from a subset of the population. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

predicting aggregate behavior related to the subject (i.e product) in order to increase the improve

the understanding of past or current population beliefs and behaviors and to forecast these

values. See column 1, lines 54-60, of Heching et al.

As per claim 37, Tamayo et al. teaches wherein the prediction of the behavior/activity is a

predicted monetary value of sales during a period of time (See paragraph 0235, which discloses

the probability of a recommendation being bought times the profit). However, Tamayo et al.

does not expressly disclose that the prediction is an aggregate prediction.

Heching et al. discloses predicting aggregate behavior and population estimates for a

population based on data obtained from a subset of the population (See figure 1, column 1, lines

60-67, column 4, lines 10-20 and 40-45, column 6, lines 55-65, column 7, lines 20-30 and 51-53,

which discloses predicting aggregate behavior and population estimates for a population based

on data obtained from a subset of the populations related to the subject. See also column 12,

lines 10-15).

Both Heching et al. and Tamayo et al. disclose using past data concerning a customer to

forecast behavior of customers at websites. Tamayo et al. specifically builds models that are

applicable to aggregate customers. Heching et al. teaches predicting aggregate behavior and

population estimates for a population based on data obtained from a subset of the population. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

predicting aggregate behavior related to the subject (i.e product) in order to increase the improve

the understanding of past or current population beliefs and behaviors and to forecast these

values. See column 1, lines 54-60, of Heching et al. Claims 38-40 and 41 recite equivalent

limitations to claims 16-18 and 20, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and

rationale as set forth above.

Claim 42 recites equivalent limitations to claims 27 and 28 and is therefore rejected using

the same art and rationale set forth above.

Claim 43 recites equivalent limitations to claims 30-31 and 33 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is 571-272-6737. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 571-272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

bvd
December 17, 2008

BETH VAN DOREN
PRIMARY EXAMINER